



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/725,210	12/01/2003	Andreas Seidel	PO-7824/LeA 36,084	4685
157	7590	01/05/2006	EXAMINER	
BAYER MATERIAL SCIENCE LLC 100 BAYER ROAD PITTSBURGH, PA 15205				BUTTNER, DAVID J
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1712		

DATE MAILED: 01/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/725,210	SEIDEL ET AL.	
	Examiner David Buttner	Art Unit 1712	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2005.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-13 and 15-25 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1,3-13,15-25 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
     1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
     2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
     3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Art Unit: 1712

Claims 1,3-13 and 15-25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification provides no tri- or tetrafunctional phenols having amine groups. Isatinbiscresol is believed to have only two phenolic groups (see col 8 line 25 of Idel '009).

Claims 5 and 7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5 lists (meth)acrylic acid esters as possibly being 50-99 parts of the shell, but later limits (meth)acrylic esters to 1-50 parts. The two limitations are inconsistent. A hypothetical shell of 80% methylmethacrylate and 20% ethylacrylate would not meet the claim because the "1-50 parts" limitation would be violated. Is this intended?

Isatinbiscresol is believed to have only two phenolic groups (see col 8 line 18 of Idel '009). Therefore, claim 7's isatinbiscresol cannot qualify as the trifunctional phenolic of claim 1.

Claims 1,3-7,10-13,15-19 and 21-25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Itagaki '766.

Itagaki exemplifies blends of polycarbonate, metablenS2001, phosphate flame retardant and PTFE. MetablenS2001 is one of applicant's preferred grafts (see page 22

line 27 of spec). Although the examples do not use branched polycarbonates, Itagaki (col 3 line 63) teaches the polycarbonate can be branched with isatinbiscresol. Use of such a branched polycarbonate would have been obvious if not considered anticipatory.

Claims 8-10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itagaki '766 in view of Idel '009.

Itagaki does not teach how much branching agent to use in the polycarbonate.

Idel exemplifies polycarbonates containing small amounts of isatinbiscresol col 10 line 25). It would have been obvious to use these small amounts of branching agent in Itagaki's polycarbonate for the expected advantages. Also note Idel correlates MW to relative viscosity (col 7 line 41-45).

Applicant's arguments filed 11/10/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues Itagaki does not require his graft to be other than butadiene based.

This is not convincing. Itagaki's graft is based on a acrylate/siloxane composite. This does not contain butadiene. Applicant's "other than polybutadiene" does nothing to distinguish from Itagaki.

Applicant argues Itagaki's polycarbonate is not necessarily branched.

This is not convincing. Rejection over the broad disclosure (including alternatives) of the prior art is proper (MPEP 2123). A reference that clearly names the claimed species anticipates the claim no matter how many other species are named (MPEP 2131.02).

Art Unit: 1712

Kozakura, J2001226576, WO99/57198 do not have amine functional branching agents. The translation removes the Seidel 2003/153658 rejection. The terminal disclaimer removes the obviousness double patenting.

No previous claim simultaneously required specific amounts of branching and that the branching agent have amine groups. This required the new rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Buttner whose telephone number is 571-272-1084. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 10 to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski, can be reached on 571-272-1302. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1712

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Buttner

12/30/05

DAVID J. BUTTNER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

*David Buttner*